

the relevant management programs and request that the State agency(ies) provide the Federal agency with review, and if necessary, conditions, based on specific enforceable policies, that would permit the State agency to concur with the Federal agency's consistency determination. State agency concurrence shall remove the need for the State agency to review individual uses of the general permit for consistency with the enforceable policies of management programs. Federal agencies shall, pursuant to the consistent to the maximum extent practicable standard in §930.32, incorporate State conditions into the general permit. If the State agency's conditions are not incorporated into the general permit or a State agency objects to the general permit, then the Federal agency shall notify potential users of the general permit that the general permit is not available for use in that State unless an applicant under subpart D of this part or a person under subpart E of this part, who wants to use the general permit in that State provides the State agency with a consistency certification under subpart D of this part and the State agency concurs. When subpart D or E of this part applies, all provisions of the relevant subpart apply.

(e) The terms "Federal agency activity" and "Federal development project" also include modifications of any such activity or development project which affect any coastal use or resource, provided that, in the case of modifications of an activity or development project which the State agency has previously reviewed, the effect on any coastal use or resource is substantially different than those previously reviewed by the State agency.

[65 FR 77154, Dec. 8, 2000, as amended at 71 FR 826, Jan. 5, 2006]

§ 930.32 Consistent to the maximum extent practicable.

(a)(1) The term "consistent to the maximum extent practicable" means fully consistent with the enforceable policies of management programs unless full consistency is prohibited by existing law applicable to the Federal agency.

(2) Section 307(e) of the Act does not relieve Federal agencies of the consist-

ency requirements under the Act. The Act was intended to cause substantive changes in Federal agency decision-making within the context of the discretionary powers residing in such agencies. Accordingly, whenever legally permissible, Federal agencies shall consider the enforceable policies of management programs as requirements to be adhered to in addition to existing Federal agency statutory mandates. If a Federal agency asserts that full consistency with the management program is prohibited, it shall clearly describe, in writing, to the State agency the statutory provisions, legislative history, or other legal authority which limits the Federal agency's discretion to be fully consistent with the enforceable policies of the management program.

(3) For the purpose of determining consistent to the maximum extent practicable under paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section, federal legal authority includes Federal appropriation Acts if the appropriation Act includes language that specifically prohibits full consistency with specific enforceable policies of management programs. Federal agencies shall not use a general claim of a lack of funding or insufficient appropriated funds or failure to include the cost of being fully consistent in Federal budget and planning processes as a basis for being consistent to the maximum extent practicable with an enforceable policy of a management program. The only circumstance where a Federal agency may rely on a lack of funding as a limitation on being fully consistent with an enforceable policy is the Presidential exemption described in section 307(c)(1)(B) of the Act (16 USC 1456(c)(1)(B)). In cases where the cost of being consistent with the enforceable policies of a management program was not included in the Federal agency's budget and planning processes, the Federal agency should determine the amount of funds needed and seek additional federal funds. Federal agencies should include the cost of being fully consistent with the enforceable policies of management programs in their budget and planning processes, to the same extent that a Federal agency

would plan for the cost of complying with other federal requirements.

(b) A Federal agency may deviate from full consistency with an approved management program when such deviation is justified because of an emergency or other similar unforeseen circumstance (“exigent circumstance”), which presents the Federal agency with a substantial obstacle that prevents complete adherence to the approved program. Any deviation shall be the minimum necessary to address the exigent circumstance. Federal agencies shall carry out their activities consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of a management program, to the extent that the exigent circumstance allows. Federal agencies shall consult with State agencies to the extent that an exigent circumstance allows and shall attempt to seek State agency concurrence prior to addressing the exigent circumstance. Once the exigent circumstances have passed, and if the Federal agency is still carrying out an activity with coastal effects, Federal agencies shall comply with all applicable provisions of this subpart to ensure that the activity is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of management programs. Once the Federal agency has addressed the exigent circumstance or completed its emergency response activities, it shall provide the State agency with a description of its actions and their coastal effects.

(c) A classified activity that affects any coastal use or resource is not exempt from the requirements of this subpart, unless the activity is exempted by the President under section 307(c)(1)(B) of the Act. Under the consistent to the maximum extent practicable standard, the Federal agency shall provide to the State agency a description of the project and coastal effects that it is legally permitted to release or does not otherwise breach the classified nature of the activity. Even when a Federal agency may not be able to disclose project information, the Federal agency shall conduct the classified activity consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the enforceable policies of management programs. The term classified means to

protect from disclosure national security information concerning the national defense or foreign policy, provided that the information has been properly classified in accordance with the substantive and procedural requirements of an executive order. Federal and State agencies are encouraged to agree on a qualified third party(ies) with appropriate security clearance(s) to review classified information and to provide non-classified comments regarding the activity’s reasonably foreseeable coastal effects.

§ 930.33 Identifying Federal agency activities affecting any coastal use or resource.

(a) Federal agencies shall determine which of their activities affect any coastal use or resource of States with approved management programs.

(1) Effects are determined by looking at reasonably foreseeable direct and indirect effects on any coastal use or resource. An action which has minimal or no environmental effects may still have effects on a coastal use (e.g., effects on public access and recreational opportunities, protection of historic property) or a coastal resource, if the activity initiates an event or series of events where coastal effects are reasonably foreseeable. Therefore, Federal agencies shall, in making a determination of effects, review relevant management program enforceable policies as part of determining effects on any coastal use or resource.

(2) If the Federal agency determines that a Federal agency activity has no effects on any coastal use or resource, and a negative determination under § 930.35 is not required, then the Federal agency is not required to coordinate with State agencies under section 307 of the Act.

(3)(i) *De minimis* Federal agency activities. Federal agencies are encouraged to review their activities, other than development projects within the coastal zone, to identify *de minimis* activities, and request State agency concurrence that these *de minimis* activities should not be subject to further State agency review. *De minimis* activities shall only be excluded from State agency review if a Federal agency and State agency have agreed. The State